

EX-CATHOLIC INFIDEL

J. C. Hannon Tells How He Converted Priest Hyacinthe Ringrose to Infidelity.

A SMILE THAT WON'T COME OFF.

Philadelphia, Pa., Jan. 18, 1904.

Brother Moonie:—About ten years ago there was a great wave of retarding among the silk stocking element of this city comprising the "Catholic Literary."

A bright young Jesuit, a son of Vale, Hyacinthe Ringrose, posing as the champion of Catholicism, entered this city with flying colors.

He had been staring the country on the trial of the Boston school-making some noise, and it was said making many converts to their peculiar graft.

Mr. Ringrose had many of them in debate and according to his reports was always correct (7), completely punctured their tires and left them sadder and wiser men.

There was then an atheist Father Pauline, Philadelphia, and they met in debate at the "Christian Evidence Society."

Ringrose was badly upset and left for parts unknown. Ringrose was the greatest hero of the hour, and even among the ladies.

What! Hobson wasn't in? R. and to the chagrin, the brightest soon in to galaxy of Freethinkers, Mary Elwell, hopped to the grand hippodrome, and is now the pet of the Catholic society.

Another wealthy and prominent lady of the Freethought ranks, Mrs. Emmanuel, yielded to the same hypnotic influence as the headquarters of polite Catholic society, in her home, 1239 Spring Garden St.

Everything from an Archibald to a cowboy, a manly boy, a gay guest, and Mary Elwell is the master of cerebration.

With Ringrose in the highest element of his fame, the Liberal League of Philadelphia, the largest publishing lectures and one of the largest publishing houses got him to edit a "Lambeth Review."

About this time I had formed Ringrose and a number of others to unite at times sprung up between us.

I being an ex-Catholic, knew his weak points and the signs of apostasy.

I quizzed him on his religious propaganda and found that he was as profoundly ignorant as any man I ever heard him hollered to in a public debate, but behaved down to the signature that his speech was ex-cretins.

We agreed, however, to enter a joint discussion on the subject of the League. I selected as the subject, "Ethical Teachings of the Christian Church Compared with Those of Christ." We had a packed house—about 1,200 people.

As a matter of formality I permitted him to speak first, but the signs of applause was like a college rumble, and I realized that the audience packed the room.

That just suited me as was anxious to see him.

On January 10, I delivered and published a lecture entitled "The Psychology of Religion," which I gave to every priest and club I could reach requesting a reply either in print or in person. I received a favorable answer from the Bishop of Cleveland.

We agreed to meet at the church of the Resurrection, and I read my lecture to the audience.

I gave a copy to him, suggesting that he might help him to explain away misconceptions of history. After reading it, he said, "You know, Mr. Hannon, that's a foul bird that defiles its own nest."

Ringrose is a member of no meanшиб�, he packed a most glowing tribute to Confucius.

Outside of the liberals there was not a dozen of that mob who knew what he was about, and my suspicion that while he was a Catholic by birth and profession, he was afterward admitted to me privately.

I agreed with him to attack the church and his address, he gave me no reason to do so, but when I took the most severe and the chairman had much trouble to keep the plaudits from the audience, he seemed pleased right there and then.

I admitted that I was not a college graduate, but a simple catholic parochial school boy, and that my name was John S. Holman, and the name of four generations of Roman Catholic ancestors and that I had never seen the platform was to pose as a terrible example of so-called Catholicism.

I congratulated the opening speaker upon having paid a glorious sermon to the Negroes, philosophy the Catholic church was wise enough to accept, but not for the secular colleges and Free-thought schools, where the Negro could have no more meaning to the average Christian than some new brand of hell.

I challenged the speaker, or any other person to mention the Negro, any other person to whom ever originated in Christ, a single nation ever converted to Christ, and the chairman had much trouble to keep the plaudits from the audience.

I authorized to speak for the ladies in question, a Negro rather than by construction, and as for Mr. Ringrose, I pled: "We did not repudiate Catholicism, over all, we did not repudiate it."

The laugh that greeted the statement continued for some time, and the audience continued to smile, but my host did not come off with a smile.

Now comes what follows. In the Catholic Standard and Times, published in Philadelphia, appears an article entitled "Dear Father Hyacinthe Ringrose," written by Hyacinthe Ringrose, last September.

It states that the new Pope, Pius X, has sold the Pope's "smart" to the world.

I read the article and smiled. In a later edition of the same paper there was a note that Hyacinthe Ringrose had become an prominent member of the legal profession in New York, and was a very successful and prominent lady, and was an uncompromising atheist.

I read that and smiled. During Christmas week I received from Ringrose, the following letter, which I have been smiling ever since:

"30 Fifth Ave., New York City.

"Dear Father Hannon:

"You will see that I am spending the winter in Europe.

"Since seeing you I have been to Europe on my vacation, to face the new Pope, Francis, Sarto, 'Christ's Vicar on Earth.'

"Of course you understand that my letter is to you, and I am sending it to you.

"I am writing to you because the

"last straw that broke the cam-

ple's back, and confirmed your own statement that the Romish church is the religious Tammany of the twentieth century."

"The way how are the dear ladies converts succeeding with their propaganda among what you call the Catholic set?"

"It is to thank you that you come to me with such a batch string is out."

"With best regards,

"ANTHIE BIGROSE."

"Will some of 'The Catholic smart set' tell us who the laugh is on now?"

J. C. HANNON.

January 18th, 1904.

SOMEWHAT LY IRATE

Editor of The Humanitarian Review Speaks His Piece.

Los Angeles, Calif., Jan. 15, 1904.

Charles C. Moore:

Dear Sir.—Yours of the 10th, last, on my inquiries at hand, You say little, if any, remembrance of ever having seen me. The Humanitarian Review.

You are a professed "infidel." I suppose I am justified in accepting that as "good gospel." But had I sent you get well cards in exchange for your orthodox Christian publication for nearly a year? If so, you are a scoundrel.

There was then an atheist Father Pauline, Philadelphia, and they met in debate at the "Christian Evidence Society."

Ringrose was badly upset and left for parts unknown. Ringrose was the greatest hero of the hour, and even among the ladies.

What! Hobson wasn't in? R. and to the chagrin, the brightest soon in to galaxy of Freethinkers, Mary Elwell, well, hopped to the grand hippodrome, and is now the pet of the Catholic society.

Another wealthy and prominent lady of the Freethought ranks, Mrs. Emmanuel, yielded to the same hypnotic influence as the headquarters of polite Catholic society, in her home, 1239 Spring Garden St.

Everything from an Archibald to a cowboy, a manly boy, a gay guest, and Mary Elwell is the master of cerebration.

With Ringrose in the highest element of his fame, the Liberal League of Philadelphia, the largest publishing lectures and one of the largest publishing houses got him to edit a "Lambeth Review."

About this time I had formed Ringrose and a number of others to unite at times sprung up between us.

I being an ex-Catholic, knew his weak points and the signs of apostasy.

I quizzed him on his religious propaganda and found that he was as profoundly ignorant as any man I ever heard him hollered to in a public debate, but behaved down to the signature that his speech was ex-cretins.

We agreed, however, to enter a joint discussion on the subject of the League. I selected as the subject, "Ethical Teachings of the Christian Church Compared with Those of Christ."

We had a packed house—about 1,200 people.

As a matter of formality I permitted him to speak first, but the signs of applause was like a college rumble, and I realized that the audience packed the room.

That just suited me as was anxious to see him.

On January 10, I delivered and published a lecture entitled "The Psychology of Religion," which I gave to every priest and club I could reach requesting a reply either in print or in person. I received a favorable answer from the Bishop of Cleveland.

We agreed to meet at the church of the Resurrection, and I read my lecture to the audience.

I gave a copy to him, suggesting that he might help him to explain away misconceptions of history. After reading it, he said, "You know, Mr. Hannon, that's a foul bird that defiles its own nest."

Ringrose is a member of no meanшиб�, he packed a most glowing tribute to Confucius.

Outside of the liberals there was not a dozen of that mob who knew what he was about, and my suspicion that while he was a Catholic by birth and profession, he was afterward admitted to me privately.

I agreed with him to attack the church and his address, he gave me no reason to do so, but when I took the most severe and the chairman had much trouble to keep the plaudits from the audience, he seemed pleased right there and then.

I authorized to speak for the ladies in question, a Negro rather than by construction, and as for Mr. Ringrose, I pled: "We did not repudiate Catholicism, over all, we did not repudiate it."

The laugh that greeted the statement continued for some time, and the audience continued to smile, but my host did not come off with a smile.

Now comes what follows. In the Catholic Standard and Times, published in Philadelphia, appears an article entitled "Dear Father Hyacinthe Ringrose," written by Hyacinthe Ringrose, last September.

It states that the new Pope, Pius X, has sold the Pope's "smart" to the world.

I read the article and smiled. In a later edition of the same paper there was a note that Hyacinthe Ringrose had become an prominent member of the legal profession in New York, and was a very successful and prominent lady, and was an uncompromising atheist.

I read that and smiled. During Christmas week I received from Ringrose, the following letter, which I have been smiling ever since:

"30 Fifth Ave., New York City.

"Dear Father Hannon:

"You will see that I am spending the winter in Europe.

"Since seeing you I have been to Europe on my vacation, to face the new Pope, Francis, Sarto, 'Christ's Vicar on Earth.'

"Of course you understand that my letter is to you, and I am sending it to you.

"I am writing to you because the

SHORT LETTERS

Scammons, Kansas.—I enclose draft for one-fourth of the sum I promised to give the Blade to tide over its financial troubles. I will send the balance in due season. I want the Blade to live and prosper, and I hope that the subscribers that are still with us will give \$5 each the Blade can get free from debt and insure the Blade's future income.

If we only had a fork-tailed devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If the patrons of the Blade would give us as much support as the members of our church-folk do, we could make them pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could catch him, we could make him pay us back.

If we only had a good-hearted devil and we could

BILLY BRECK'S

"Santa Claus" Editorial Seems to be
Repudiated by His Alleged "Accomplice" as a Piece of
Christian Fraud.

Lexington, Ky., Jan. 9, 1904.

Mr. Charles C. Moore:

My Dear Charley:—Referring to your criticism of Col. Breckinridge's "Santa Claus Reinstated," didn't you fail to observe that my note to him was of December 20th, and that I could not probably anticipated his editorial (to which he appended his note) of December 23rd?

How do you know that he who "subscribed for Dog Fennel in the Orient, and wrote a notice of the book that was as eloquent as words could make it," endorses the editorial you criticise? How do you know that he has enjoyed the book more than he did Dog Fennel? How do you know that he enjoyed it all in the sense you inseminate?

"What a lot of queer people it takes to make a book!"

About the time the Santa Claus letter was written to the little girl, or no, long before, you and your infidel preacher trying to make people believe something you knew was not true?

Do you want, in the light of your criticism, even intelligent person in the community to be reminded of the fact that C. C. Moore is the author of "The Night Before Christmas"—that remarkable poem personifying an everlasting popularity.

Santa Claus,

Yours interrogatively and truly,
T. D. B.

Answer.—I don't even remember that there was any date to your note to Breckinridge, and besides that an editorial note in the *Standard* of New Haven of Dec. 23rd may have been written on Dec. 20th, the date you say of your note, and may have been written when you two together were in New Haven. Your note to the editorial in which he was to cite you as an "accomplice" with him in assisting him to make a little girl believe in Santa Claus, and you and your infidel preacher trying to make people believe something you knew was not true?

The *Standard* of Waco, Texas, good magazine and good editor—has had a heard time, but seems just now, to be improving.

The *Standard* of Waco, two months ago came very near turning up its little toes to the dantes, and then came a reaction and it had the most profligate circulation ever known. To write now, January 18th, there is quite a slack in its financial support, though there seems to be no slack in the number of readers.

It's getting to be the case now that almost any kind of a newspaper or magazine of any respectable printing establishment and we infidel propagandists can hardly say anything than many of them which Christian papers would dare not do, but we seem to find that infidels are dropping infidel propaganda papers because we have gotten all other prominent newspapers to talking like we do.

throws up to me that I have been a preacher, and I am not honest enough to say that I am a young fool who did not know any better, because I was led by a lot of really old preachers who were preaching and living for money, and I never saw any other preacher except Billy Breckinridge that did; both of us raised side by side, but the Puritanical, hypocritical old rascals wanted to rope me into their graft because my social standing would boom the preaching trade.

GENERAL COLLAPSE IN INFIDEL PUBLICATIONS

There is going on now a collapse in infidel periodical publications, that has had no parallel before since I have been alive.

It seems specially strange, to me, as Infidelity is making far greater progress than it has ever done since I have been connected with its propagation.

Taking these collapses in the order of their occurrence, the first is that of Australia, Melbourne, Australia. Joseph Symes.

While the mechanical part of the paper is good, its contents were good, and Dog Fennel is not the only one who has not gotten a copy of the Liberator for so long a time, that I consider from a note in the *Standard*, England, that the Liberator has suspended for want of support.

Then we had the death of Bro. Green of the *Standard*, who suspended the of the *Freethought Magazine* all consequence of want of support. They were good people and had a chance.

Then *Scenes* of Toronto, Canada, editor Ellis—good paper and good man, but as a weekly and good magazine, is quite a success, and now comes *The Tom of Reason*, editor Wakeman, the most scholarly editor we have, honest and fair, making a weekly paper, and with the suspended *Freethought Magazine* to make a monthly magazine.

Then the Boston Investigator, editor of the *Standard*, is suspended, and edited by a good man, is in a chronic struggle for existence.

The *Scalp* of Waco, Texas, good magazine and good editor—has had a heard time, but seems just now, to be improving.

The *Standard* of Waco, two months ago came very near turning up its little toes to the dantes, and then came a reaction and it had the most profligate circulation ever known. To write now, January 18th, there is quite a slack in its financial support, though there seems to be no slack in the number of readers.

It's getting to be the case now that almost any kind of a newspaper or magazine of any respectable printing establishment and we infidel propagandists can hardly say anything than many of them which Christian papers would dare not do, but we seem to find that infidels are dropping infidel propaganda papers because we have gotten all other prominent newspapers to talking like we do.

BECKHAM ANTILL FRACAS.

The last seven days wonder in Kentucky, that is nothing if not sensational, in the life between General Beckham and my nephew, State Senator Campbell Cantrell.

Their skirmmings is a piece of youth, but I am ashamed if they ever get to be grown men—if they are intellectually, Campbell is about 6 feet 2.

I am sorry to have to break down Beckham, and I supposed he did his inspirations for United States Senator, but Beckly made a good come back.

Each of them appealed to God to bear witness that he was right and the other fellow was wrong, and as I said, I got into my car to see where God is taking a kid and I will just keep hands off.

I am recommended those lines from Dr. Watt's hymns. Little children never let you angry passions rise.

Your little hands were never made to scratch each other's eyes.

(Chicago Chronicle.)

FEARS POWERS OF PAGANISM.

Baptist College President Warns Fellow Clergymen of Danger.

"Pagan classics are popular, but they are based upon the same principles as that of one man's way of thinking away with another man's wife."

He is referring with pagan and pagan works. Our poetry is as sensuous as pagan poetry. Philosophy as taught in our college is identical with materialism.

These words started the conference of the Baptist Minister's association at its meeting yesterday in the Masonic Temple. They were spoken by J. A. Leavitt, president of Swig college.

The thoughts of Dr. Leavitt was, "Is the Trend of College Education To Christ?"

The speaker contended that the curriculum of most of the denominations did not turn to develop fellowship of the students in Christianity, but sought merely intellectual attainments.

He declared that in most of the subjects taught to the colleges not one bit of Christian doctrine could be found.

"I have never had a revival in any of our colleges, do you?" continued the president. "This is especially true of the older institutions. It would shock the world were it to be known that the Yale or Harvard would hold revival services. The emphasis in college training should be placed on faith, not on knowledge. Our education of today is not satisfied with what we have taught in our colleges such works of literature that is uplifting and Christian."

In the discussion which followed very few of the ministers took occasion to touch upon the thoughts that had been expressed by the speaker, but the speaker did not coincide entirely with what President Leavitt had said.

Resolutions of sympathy bearing on the Iroquois fire were passed.

MAN FROM PALMETTO STATE

TELLS HOW HE EVOLVED FROM A METHODIST INTO AN INFIDEL

PUSHING ALONG THE GOOD WORK

Ogden, S. C., January 8th, 1904.

Editor Charles C. Moore:

My father died when I was a boy and my mother was a good Methodist.

She taught me to read the Bible and say my prayers, but her son, and it was a strict, rip-roaring Methodist, when I could almost imagine smelted the fumes of hell, that I was frightened into joining the Methodist church.

When I grew up I began to do my own thinking which resulted in doubting some things. But mother would be of danger that I was.

Then we had the death of Bro. Green of the *Standard*, who suspended the of the *Freethought Magazine* all consequence of want of support. They were good people and had a chance.

Then *Scenes* of Toronto, Canada, editor Ellis—good paper and good man, but as a weekly and good magazine, is quite a success, and now comes *The Tom of Reason*, editor Wakeman, the most scholarly editor we have, honest and fair, making a monthly magazine.

Then the Boston Investigator, editor of the *Standard*, is suspended, and edited by a good man, is in a chronic struggle for existence.

The *Scalp* of Waco, Texas, good magazine and good editor—has had a heard time, but seems just now, to be improving.

The *Standard* of Waco, two months ago came very near turning up its little toes to the dantes, and then came a reaction and it had the most profligate circulation ever known. To write now, January 18th, there is quite a slack in its financial support, though there seems to be no slack in the number of readers.

It's getting to be the case now that almost any kind of a newspaper or magazine of any respectable printing establishment and we infidel propagandists can hardly say anything than many of them which Christian papers would dare not do, but we seem to find that infidels are dropping infidel propaganda papers because we have gotten all other prominent newspapers to talking like we do.

BECKHAM ANTILL FRACAS.

The last seven days wonder in Kentucky, that is nothing if not sensational, in the life between General Beckham and my nephew, State Senator Campbell Cantrell.

Their skirmmings is a piece of youth, but I am ashamed if they ever get to be grown men—if they are intellectually, Campbell is about 6 feet 2.

I am sorry to have to break down Beckham, and I supposed he did his inspirations for United States Senator, but Beckly made a good come back.

Each of them appealed to God to bear witness that he was right and the other fellow was wrong, and as I said, I got into my car to see where God is taking a kid and I will just keep hands off.

I am recommended those lines from Dr. Watt's hymns. Little children never let you angry passions rise.

Your little hands were never made to scratch each other's eyes.

(Chicago Chronicle.)

FEARS POWERS OF PAGANISM.

Baptist College President Warns Fellow Clergymen of Danger.

"Pagan classics are popular, but they are based upon the same principles as that of one man's way of thinking away with another man's wife."

He is referring with pagan and pagan works. Our poetry is as sensuous as pagan poetry. Philosophy as taught in our college is identical with materialism.

These words started the conference of the Baptist Minister's association at its meeting yesterday in the Masonic Temple. They were spoken by J. A. Leavitt, president of Swig college.

The thoughts of Dr. Leavitt was, "Is the Trend of College Education To Christ?"

The speaker contended that the curriculum of most of the denominations did not turn to develop fellowship of the students in Christianity, but sought merely intellectual attainments.

He declared that in most of the subjects taught to the colleges not one bit of Christian doctrine could be found.

"I have never had a revival in any of our colleges, do you?" continued the president. "This is especially true of the older institutions. It would shock the world were it to be known that the Yale or Harvard would hold revival services. The emphasis in college training should be placed on faith, not on knowledge. Our education of today is not satisfied with what we have taught in our colleges such works of literature that is uplifting and Christian."

In the discussion which followed very few of the ministers took occasion to touch upon the thoughts that had been expressed by the speaker, but the speaker did not coincide entirely with what President Leavitt had said.

Resolutions of sympathy bearing on the Iroquois fire were passed.

CHOP'S SISTER'S HEAD OFF.

James Brother Declares He Slew Her Because of a Divine Behest.

Dunkirk, N. Y., Jan. 24.—Miss Hanover Hall, thirty years old, was murdered at her home in Dunkirk by her brother Isaac Hall, who gave himself up to the police. Hall, who is thirty-three years old, declared he had been sent to kill his sister when he was born.

The truth is that very few people believe it is what their preachers tell them. The reason is that they buy Bibles and then believe that God would bring them to heaven if they did not sin, and then they pray for salvation.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell. We all know that the Devil is the author of all evil.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Devil wants to teach us that if God is good, almighty and benevolent, then he would not allow us to get into hell.

The Ritualistic Movement In the United States

BY JOSEPHINE K. HENRY

Nothing is more apparent to even a casual observer than that the established Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States are rapidly drifting to Rome.

Conditions in both these countries give evidence that the Ritualists, the Anglican Ritualists, have a common understanding with each other. To the world the Romanists and the Ritualists pretend to hate each other but actual conditions prove only a dead Jesuitical game to land the Episcopal church in the bosom of Rome.

The High churchmen all deny that they are drifting to Rome, and the Low churchmen say the accusation is correct and that the church is being betrayed bodily by Jesuits sent directly from the power of the Roman hierarchy.

The secular and religious press portray the signs of the times with great enthusiasm.

When an influential and wealthy Protestant sect gives evidence that it is drifting with Rome to the time of the true American to ask: "Whither are we drifting?"

The encroachment of Romanism, that now measures American principles移植 by Lincoln, and the utterances of R. C. prelates that "America will be Romanized within fifty years" show that the spirit has increased since Lincoln's day.

Since this press gives evidence that it is largely under Jesuitical censorship American citizens are summoned to Rome to answer for the crime of loyalty to American institutions; and the Pope of the United States consults with R. C. prelates, and coquets with the Pope of Rome; since there are thousands of people who are not even aware of the principles of American liberty for any office from policemen to president, surely it follows.

Romanism seems to have a watch on the Protestant sect that is turning the tide toward Rome.

A spirit of unrest in the Protestant sects, the religious Stand general, and what will be the ultimate fate of Protestantism cannot now be surmised. There is but one branch of Protestantism that seems to have a truly objective in view and that is the Protestant Episcopal.

All the others are tooting about on the sea of uncertainty, recasting creeds, eliminating dogmas and appealing for support through social features and the spectacular in mode of work.

"Where are we at?" seems to be the one question at church councils and receives no answer.

The Episcopalians alone know where they are at New York, and they are steering straight for Rome. They do not know the way to go and they have selected an underground that leads to the bosom of the mother church, aping the Ritualists of England, and a similar heresy in the American church, and its Jesuitical methods are drifting the church over to the Roman hierarchy.

It has been a fail in England and the United States for Ritualists of immense wealth to join the R. C. church until the Episcopal church in both countries is of not bed of Roman Catholicism.

Of all the faults the religious fad is most virulent, and the apostle to bring the world to reason, if set free, will sacrifice conviction, silence reason and betray country to keep in the swine.

England never did heartily espouse Protestantism. Scotland and the other Protestant countries of Europe forced the breach with Rome and England consented in a half-hearted manner.

The Church of England was always a giant imposture. It never stood for anything, and was the root of a diplomatic intrigue and intrigue.

J. M. Davidson in speaking of the founding of the Episcopal church says: "That the English Episcopalians, from the first, in favor of the Faith" came up to that very faith of which the Holy Father had constituted him titular. "Defended is one of the best words, and it is the most plausible stories to be found in the pages of universal history. How any Anglican can 'High' or 'Low' Broad, square or perpendicular, could corrupt the origin of his National Zion, and the unwavering character of its first 'High,' without feelings of remorse and abhorrence, is beyond me."

There was a ritualistic crisis in England recently, and one is now near at hand in the American church.

The Romish party is composed of the most educated portion of the church councils and so adroitly have they usurped power that the majority of the laity have been unaware of their perfidy.

This Romish party daily grows more aggressive.

They publish now a monthly paper at Garrison-on-the-Hudson, called "The Lamp."

"There are no dark lantern method about 'The Lamp,' it openly commits itself to a policy of 'reunion with Rome.'

The following editorial speaks for itself:

"Protestants who glory in their sectarian divisions, yes, and Anglicans who glory in their separation from their shamed fathers, see the remedy save to acknowledge the error our fathers made four hundred years ago and to come to action then to the necessary measures which will in due time heal our schisms and make us Catholics indeed by returning to the fold of the Episcopal church Bishop H. C. Potter of New York:

Cooperstown, N. Y., June 25, 1903.
C. Fillingham, Vicar of Hexton, Eng.

Dear Sir—In the public prints of yesterday I find a letter from you addressed to me, and later this letter reached me through the mail. You request my opinion of the Church of England. A clergyman is usually a gentleman and aware that he may print a private letter himself to the person to whom it is addressed.

You are a luminary is more likely, for only a lunatic could suppose that you are a New York government official or a member of the Romish party. We were asking what this condition with Rome means, and what influence it will have on the destiny of the Republic? A pebble can move the current of a mighty stream.

Better an enemy in open honorable battle than one in ambush, and I trust you will not do me the disservice of training its troops to our government that has protected its religious liberty by taxes from taxation.

Roman Catholicism and Anglo-Ritualism are the same thing, and they stand together opposed to the freedom of conscience, opposed to the progress of the church, and opposed to the education of the masses, and are both stand defenders of the adverse right of kings.

Greece before the walls of Troy are full of armed enemies to the Americans.

The disintegration of Protestantism, the drifting to Rome and the compact Federation of all Roman Catholic organizations is evolving the religious Armageddon of the future which will be between Rome and Protestantism.

If the "Temple of Liberty" is ever built, the blood of its defenders will be upon the Ritualists who by subtle intrigue caused the tide running toward Rome.

Very truly yours,
Bishop of New York.

This letter is a fine expose of the

lovely Christian spirit and type of Protestantism possessed by this Bishop and it would have been appropriate for him to have ordered the singing throughout his diocese of that hymn:

"Blest be the tie that binds,
In Christian love.
The fellowship of kindred minds
is like to that above."

This is the Vicar's reply to Bishop of New York:

Fifth Avenue Hotel, New York,
Bishop Potter, Cooperstown, N. Y., Rr.

I am in receipt of your very violent and insulting letter of yesterday's date. I suppose so extraordinary a letter was never before passed by a Roman Catholic minister.

You are, or affect to be, unaware that open letters are frequently written to public men. You are also apparently a person who has declared that she has no intention of differing in anything from the doctrine, discipline and polity of the church.

I suppose that you are also unaware of the fact that the ritual of St. Mary, the Virgin, differs from the ritual of the Virgin of the Assumption.

"I salute thee, Holy Mary, daughter of God, the Father, whose love we obtain to obtain a day in thine own, the most sweet will of God."

Holy Mother, mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death. Amen.

We have the Virgin Mother of God the Holy Ghost, and entreat to obtain for us such yielding of the blessed sacrament that we may need not groan again in thought, work or death in all things He may direct and rule our hearts. Hal Mary, etc."

No edict from a Romish Cardinal or from the Vatican was ever more severely Romish than the above, yet one settles at once the question of the religious fidelity of the Deity.

The Episcopalian Rev. Arthur Lloyd, who looks and dresses like a Romish cardinal, "will emphasize his belief in the necessity of a reunion with the 'Holy See,'" he has begun to say. Peter's Pence sending his annual contribution to Rome like a good Catholic."

A demand for an American Pope is loudly made.

In the current issue of the Churchman, the leading papal organ, a chief executive for the Episcopal church is demanded in a leading article, which declares that a chief executive is necessary for the church as for a nation.

The smooth cassocked clergy of the Episcopal church that have constituted orders of clerics, now called the "Priests" and the "Fathers of the Holy Cross" whose superior is Father J. O. Conner, New York, and their methods are the same as those of the Romish Paulist Fathers and Jesusites.

Other clerics have been formed in the P. E. church where clergy and laity are required to pledge themselves to promote the union with the Romish church.

The Episcopalian priests of this pectoral of ecclesiastical titles appears with the article.

The Bible says "man is made in the image of God,"

and is prepared to express an opinion on the facial beauty of a son of God, made in his Father's image, we cannot refrain from saying if the costume of the Deity is like that of the Romish ritualistic Bishop it is stunning in the extreme, for surely "Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."

It does seem that after doing all their ecclesiastical millinery in regalia with flowing petticoats and acaded and bejeweled robes left out the Lord in the beauty of holiness gave souls, or make overtures to the Pope of Rome.

The Episcopalian popes are as much a part of the Romish church as the Episcopalian church are one victim of a gigantic conspiracy, and the Romish is now running to high and too strong to be checked.

The Pope of Rome is the treasure of the earth, and call them selves "miserable sinners" to recognize the serpent that has coiled itself about them and has caused them to be the property of the church.

The proposition to change the name of the church to "American Catholic" has been defeated by a majority of the diocesan conventions the past year, but the star chamber Jesuit will be pursued until the Episcopalian church is eliminated from the denominational calendar.

To couple words of American and Canadian from a religious point of view the author of "The Lamp" will come to us, well come, the words free truth, free slavery and vicious virtue.

To a good Canadian who is deeply interested in England, and the Romish party, and the Romish party set for them, will sacrifice conviction, silence reason and betray country to keep in the swine.

England never did heartily espouse Protestantism. Scotland and the other Protestant countries of Europe forced the breach with Rome and England consented in a half-hearted manner.

The Church of England was always a giant imposture. It never stood for anything, and was the root of a diplomatic intrigue and intrigue.

J. M. Davidson in speaking of the founding of the Episcopal church says: "That the English Episcopalians, from the first, in favor of the Faith" came up to that very faith of which the Holy Father had constituted him titular. "Defended is one of the best words, and it is the most plausible stories to be found in the pages of universal history. How any Anglican can 'High' or 'Low' Broad, square or perpendicular, could corrupt the origin of his National Zion, and the unwavering character of its first 'High,' without feelings of remorse and abhorrence, is beyond me."

There was a ritualistic crisis in England recently, and one is now near at hand in the American church.

The Romish party is composed of the most educated portion of the church councils and so adroitly have they usurped power that the majority of the laity have been unaware of their perfidy.

This Romish party daily grows more aggressive.

They publish now a monthly paper at Garrison-on-the-Hudson, called "The Lamp."

"There are no dark lantern method about 'The Lamp,' it openly commits itself to a policy of 'reunion with Rome.'

The following editorial speaks for itself:

"Protestants who glory in their sectarian divisions, yes, and Anglicans who glory in their separation from their shamed fathers, see the remedy save to acknowledge the error our fathers made four hundred years ago and to come to action then to the necessary measures which will in due time heal our schisms and make us Catholics indeed by returning to the fold of the Episcopal church Bishop H. C. Potter of New York:

Cooperstown, N. Y., June 25, 1903.
C. Fillingham, Vicar of Hexton, Eng.

Dear Sir—In the public prints of yesterday I find a letter from you addressed to me, and later this letter reached me through the mail. You request my opinion of the Church of England. A clergyman is usually a gentleman and aware that he may print a private letter himself to the person to whom it is addressed.

Better an enemy in open honorable battle than one in ambush, and I trust you will not do me the disservice of training its troops to our government that has protected its religious liberty by taxes from taxation.

Roman Catholicism and Anglo-Ritualism are the same thing, and they stand together opposed to the freedom of conscience, opposed to the progress of the church, and opposed to the education of the masses, and are both stand defenders of the adverse right of kings.

Greece before the walls of Troy are full of armed enemies to the Americans.

The disintegration of Protestantism, the drifting to Rome and the compact Federation of all Roman Catholic organizations is evolving the religious Armageddon of the future which will be between Rome and Protestantism.

If the "Temple of Liberty" is ever built, the blood of its defenders will be upon the Ritualists who by subtle intrigue caused the tide running toward Rome.

Very truly yours,
Bishop of New York.

This letter is a fine expose of the

ANOTHER REVIVALIST CALLED DOWN

Editor Blue Grass Blade.

The following article appeared in the Webster City Freeman-Tribune, our local paper, in answer to the question of a Campbellite minister "What have Infidels done to you?" I have produced no new facts for Infidels, but old ones are as good when an audience packing the church to the doors seems to accept every statement from the pulpit as though it were the truth.

If the statements by ministers about Infidels were to be believed, Infidels would at once be characterized as monumental ignoramuses or wilful falsifiers but coming from the class who have "god-wombs" on their persons, a little consideration is given them.

No real harm is done by Infidels, and indeed the minister in later talk made very conciliatory remarks towards those opposed to his methods and belief. I also wrote the editor of the Tribune a personal letter asking if the church people were doing their duty in spending time and money and energy to convert the heathen and infidels, and he replied that you must not try to save one Infidel in their midst, but I have now been nearly four years and a minister not lay but a personal friend, and he has received no answer to the letter nor to my personal letter.

Two revival meetings are being held here, the branches are located just across the street from each other, I am an interested onlooker and not surprised to have to repeat myself after half a dozen pulpit meetings.

He begins his article with this statement "God is a ritualist." What a Bishop does not know about God is not worth knowing, and this one settles at once the question of the religious practices of the Deity.

What a Bishop does not know about God is not worth knowing, and this one settles at once the question of the religious practices of the Deity.

Very truly yours,
R. C. FILLINGHAM,
VICAR OF HEXTON, ENGLAND.

* * *

In a recent issue of Munsey's Magazine the Bishop of Fou d' Lac, Rev. Charles C. Grafton, has an article on the subject of the Episcopalian church.

Episcopalian Rev. Arthur Lloyd, who looks and dresses like a Romish cardinal, "will emphasize his belief in the necessity of a reunion with the 'Holy See,'" he has begun to say. Peter's Pence sending his annual contribution to Rome like a good Catholic."

A demand for an American Pope is loudly made.

The Episcopalian popes are as

the Romish Paulist Fathers and Jesusites.

Other clerics have been formed in the P. E. church where clergy and laity are required to pledge themselves to promote the union with the Romish church.

The Episcopalian priests of this pectoral of ecclesiastical titles appears with the article.

The Bible says "man is made in the image of God,"

and is prepared to express an opinion on the facial beauty of a son of God, made in his Father's image, we cannot refrain from saying if the costume of the Deity is like that of the Romish ritualistic Bishop it is stunning in the extreme, for surely "Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."

It does seem that after doing all their ecclesiastical millinery in regalia with flowing petticoats and acaded and bejeweled robes left out the Lord in the beauty of holiness gave souls, or make overtures to the Pope of Rome.

The Episcopalian popes are as much a part of the Romish church as the Episcopalian church are one victim of a gigantic conspiracy, and the Romish is now running to high and too strong to be checked.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.

To the Editor of the Tribune even the Pope of Rome is bad in many ways.